



3 1761 05264604 9

# ALLIED and AMERICAN

---

---

## PEACE TERMS

---

---

D  
613  
M4

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER




*Presented to the*  
LIBRARY *of the*  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
*by*

PROFESSOR

S. A. B. MERCER





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



**ALLIED AND AMERICAN  
PEACE TERMS**



# Allied and American Peace Terms

As Seen by a Linguist

By

Samuel A. B. Mercer, Ph.D., D.D.

Professor of Semitic Languages, in the  
Western Theological Seminary, Chicago,  
and Editor of the Journal of the Society  
of Oriental Research

The Young Churchman Co.

Milwaukee

1918

TO  
H. M. M.

*"Peace rules the day, where reason rules the mind"*

D  
613  
M4





## PREFACE

**N**O thinking person can remain silent in the present world conflict; he will deliver himself in private conversations, in public lectures, or in print. The author of the present study believes that what he has to say may be of interest to a wider public than that which can be reached through the spoken word. His linguistic training has led him to emphasize the part which language plays in the formation of nationality and the part it must play in the development of internationalism. He realizes also that with language must be associated the functions of geography, politics, and history, as determinants of nationality, in the growth of social groups and in the ultimate development

of a world group. He has tried to suggest that a just and lasting peace will be a world peace if these determinants of nationality can be translated into international terms.

The words of President Wilson and Premier Lloyd George quoted in the following pages are taken from reports of their recent speeches of January the eighth and the fifth respectively.

April, 1918.

## CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. WAR AND PEACE . . . . .	5
III. THE APPLICATION . . . . .	14
IV. TOWARDS A JUST AND LASTING PEACE . . .	54





# I

## INTRODUCTION

**A**FTER the guns have ceased to fire, the cannon to roar, and the soldiers to fight, will come the most critical period in the new world order in which we are to live. Statesmen will meet to inaugurate peace and to plan for the future. Keen insight and high purpose should prevail if peace is to be just and lasting. The mistakes of the past must not be repeated. As Lloyd George has just said: "We can no longer submit the future of European civilization to the arbitrary decisions of a few negotiators trying to secure by chicanery or persuasion the interests of this or that dynasty or nation." What Lloyd

George has said in direct reference to European civilization is true of the world, for with a disrupted Europe the world can never be secure, but with the problems of Europe justly and enduringly settled world peace is a possibility.

The first task of statesmen will be to take steps to remove the provocation of war. To do that it is fundamental that a positive step be first taken. This will consist in the recognition of the determinants of nationality. As far as possible each nation must be accorded its natural rights in order to avoid international irritation which is the ultimate cause of all war. The determinants of nationality are language, geography, politics, and history. A linguistic group with definite geographical barriers, with regulated politics, and with an historical background, is a national unit. It has a right to self-government and self-determination, and should be internationally protected in this right. These

criteria of nationality are reasonable and just to all and should be applied to all nations alike. Their observance is necessary to stability.

It must be remembered that religion is not a criterion of nationality, and should not be allowed to protrude itself in the determination of nationality. Religion must be free, and unlimited by national barriers. It should not be used to define nationality, and nationality should not be allowed to limit it.

After a satisfactory delimitation of nationality, the free nations thus formed should concern themselves with the welfare of those undeveloped peoples who are not yet capable of self-government. Such undeveloped peoples should be entrusted to the care of those stronger nations which have proved themselves efficient in the protection of the weak, with a view to developing, as soon as possible, the power of self-government inherent in all peoples.

In the new world order in which we are now preparing to live, violence should not be used to settle disputes between free nations any more than between individuals. National irritation must be removed by making the determinants of nationality operative, international law must be re-sanctified, and a confederation of free and liberty-loving nations must be formed, as a police force, until a world Commonwealth is realized.



## II

### WAR AND PEACE

**W**AR is usually caused by an irritation of the sense of nationality. Nations, like individuals, have their desires and ambitions, their responsibilities and rights. Whatever tends to thwart or irritate these makes for international strife.

The first step toward peace is a recognition of the fact of nationality. A nation is defined not by race, but by linguistic, geographical, historical, and political conditions. France is a nation because it is a unit linguistically, geographically, historically, and politically; but not because of race, for the inhabitants of France are not a unit racially.

They are a mixture of the three chief races of Europe, namely, the Alpine, the Mediterranean, and the Nordic. And if it be asserted that there is such a thing as a French "race", even then nationality could not be determined by race, for there are French people other than those living in France. There is no such thing as a pure race in any European country; the three great races fused into different groups of European peoples long ago. This being so, there is no race consciousness in Europe — a fact which compels us to disregard it as a basis for nationality. But Europe consists of a group of separate nations defined by language, geography, politics, and history.

Language is the chief creator of nations. By means of literature it feeds the soul of a people and unifies them. Language not only creates national feeling but it also gives outward form to a people's ideals. People who speak the

same language are bound by bonds which with care are capable of defying all barriers. A language can extend its arms over seas and continents, across rivers and mountains, and build up national feeling. The native of Newfoundland feels the thrill of English national sentiment and responds to it as readily as does a Yorkshireman. No barrier can effectively break the chain of national love which binds him to the motherland.

The unifying power of language, however, is usually limited. Language does not always override geographical barriers, but usually combines with them in the formation and preservation of national unity. Linguistic areas are usually co-terminous with geographical boundaries. A glance at the map of Europe will show how true this is. The whole continent seems, with few exceptions, to be cut up into definite linguistic areas which correspond to geographical

barriers. Frenchmen sweep eastward till they are halted by the Vosges; Czechs are confined to a plateau enclosed by mountains. Geography and language go hand in hand in the formation of national sentiment. They are the frontiers of national existence. In fact, the linguistic factor, depending upon communication, is based upon geographical foundations. A range of mountains or a watershed, even in these days of rapid transit, tends to strengthen the separating power of difference of language. Its power was absolute in less favored times, when European nations were in the process of formation.

Politics and history also play an important part in the differentiation and growth of national feeling. In fact they are sometimes so powerful as to defy the unifying power of language and geography. Western Switzerland, both by language and geography, belongs to France, Northern Switzerland for



the same reason belongs to Germany; and Southern Belgium belongs to France, if determined alone by language and geography. But politics and history have so bound the different parts of Switzerland and of Belgium together that the force of language and geography have been overcome. The same may be true of the relationship between Germany and Austria. In other words, lines of nationality are sometimes drawn so sharply by political and historical circumstances that neither linguistic nor geographical influence, nor both combined, can obliterate them. National allegiance is formed and cannot be fore-sworn.

In like manner, geographical barriers often give way to a combination of linguistic, political, and historical influence. The Rocky Mountains will never divide the United States of America into two countries, nor will they divide Eastern from Western Canada. So also

does language give way to a combination of geographical conditions, on the one hand, and political and historical influences, on the other. Quebec is French in speech but it will probably never secede from the rest of Canada to which it is bound by geographical, political, and historical ties.

In short, the determination of national frontiers, if the frontiers are to be stable, is controlled by one or more of the national determinants, language, geography, politics, and history. But once a nation has been formed, in which there has developed a national spirit, no repressive measures will avail to stifle its sense of nationality; its submerged energies will insist on bursting forth. No amount of oppression will ever kill the national feeling of Poland, and no amount of coaxing will ever persuade Ireland that she is in essence anything else than Ireland. Of course, the politics and history of a nation may be so

interwoven with those of another which speaks the same language and from which there is no geographical frontier to separate it that its destiny may be inalienably wrapped up with that of the other nation. This is certainly true of Scotland and England. It is also true of Ireland and England. In both Scotland and Ireland there is a distinct national feeling, as deep and patriotic as that in England; but the forces of language, geography, politics, and history are so strong as to make these three countries a unit of combined nationality, an essential confederation of states.

The unit of world life is normally the nation; but time and experience will most likely create a greater unit, the commonwealth. A group of distinct nations, speaking the same language, and drawn together by politics and history, where geographical obstacles are not insuperable, sometimes confederate, as in the case of the German States. In

this case, time has had the effect of creating a larger unit of national life. The same is true, only in a more democratic and ideal manner, of the commonwealth of free nations which we call the British Empire. Here is a group of nations, speaking the same language, related politically and historically, and not separated by impassable geographical barriers, formed into a great confederacy. The specific nationality of some of the units, Ireland, for example, is slower of amalgamation into the larger unit than that of the other units, but time will firmly cement the whole, and a larger unit of national life will be formed.

No nation, however, can be successfully forced into confederation. Its people are assumed to be free, self-respecting, and self-determining, whose national rights should never be violated. On the other hand, no nation need stand alone, but any may confederate



with others for comfort and safety and thus contribute to the growth of the larger unit.

### III

## THE APPLICATION

THE determinants of nationality thus outlined must form the basis of all international adjustments. After this war, when statesmen come together to lay the foundations of future peace and intercourse, the mistakes of the Treaty of Vienna in 1815, which paid no attention to the legitimate claims of national independence, must not be repeated. The great problem will be the delimitation of international frontiers. To do the work in an enduring fashion the determinants of nationality will have to be the fundamental principle of action. Peoples will have to be grouped, so far as possible, accord-

ing to the force of language, geography, politics, and history. If these factors are neglected the foundations of world peace will be insecure.

The world is weary of war, but its weariness must not betray statesmen into erecting unscientific barriers which will not stand the test of natural growth. They must brush aside as completely as possible all personal and national desires which are contrary to the growth of independent national life, and set themselves to a partition of Europe on the basis of reason and justice.

The criteria of the right of national independence must be language, geography, politics, and history. These will be found capable, if applied scientifically and justly, of solving most difficulties of partition. In case, however, a nation shows a genuine disinclination to abide by the findings of the application of these determinants, the will of the people will have to be determined by

✓ the carrying out of a plebiscite under a just international supervision.

The Allies realize, and the Central Empires are beginning to be persuaded, that a reasonable and just settlement of the international problem must be the main subject of a real peace. The Allies have already declared their intention of insisting upon the liberation of all peoples capable of self-government.

Let us try to picture, in a general way, how Europe can be so partitioned as to insure national contentment and lasting peace. And let us begin with Belgium, which has endeared itself to the hearts of all lovers of liberty and justice.

Linguistically and geographically, Belgium is not a separate nation. The South is French, the North is Teutonic; and there is no great natural barrier separating Belgium from France on the South or from Germany on the North-east. But the forces of politics and history have been so strong as to create a

real unit of national life. And any question of disharmony between Flanders and Wallonia has been completely answered by the common suffering of the present conflict. History which is now being made so rapidly in that tragic country will never give way to language and geography but will bind the whole people with the iron bands of nationality.

Belgium's history has been a very troublesome one just because of the dual tongue and the lack of effective geographical barriers. The nation has been brought forth with the greatest difficulty. The two diverse languages and regions, Flanders the lowland, and Wallonia the upland, have lived side by side with greatest discord. The Treaty of Vienna linked Belgium up with Holland but the predominant French culture of Belgium broke the bonds. It would be a mistake to try to incorporate Belgium into any other nation whatever, even



with France, in spite of the predominating character of French culture in Belgium. Belgium has been born into the family of nations. She has national ideals and a national heart. She must stand alone. Her liberty must be guaranteed. The Allies reasonably and justly insist upon her independence; her political and historical life demands it, her linguistic and geographical character permits it, and international peace will surely grant it.

While there is a firm national feeling in Luxemburg, that feeling is not sufficiently strong to counteract the influence of language and geography which point to a logical inclusion of that country into the German confederacy. The language spoken in Luxemburg is a Low German dialect, and the broken surface of the Ardenne hilly region is not a sufficient barrier to separate her from Germany. However, in case there should be any disinclination on the part of Luxemburg

to join the German confederacy, a plebiscite should be instituted whereby the will of the people would be expressed. But Luxemburg, judged by the criteria which we have adopted, is predestined to belong to Germany. The same may be said of the territory of Moresnet, a little neutral state of less than four square miles in area.

About the nationality of France, on the basis of our criteria, there is no doubt. Nor does there seem to be much doubt that not only Lorraine but also Alsace should be a part of France. Another of the mistakes made by former treaties was the robbing of France of these two states. Linguistically and geographically Lorraine is a part of France. It is so politically and historically. The treaty of Frankfort in 1871 violated these natural ties, and nature will have her revenge.

As to Alsace the case is not so clear. The physical features of Alsace mark it

off from surrounding regions. Throughout the Middle Ages it was a province of German speech. In 1910 the census recorded over eight times as many German-speaking people as French. But the national feeling of Alsace is very strongly French, and that, with its political and historical life, will perhaps prove a stronger bond than that of language and geography, especially as the geographical features render it as separable from Germany as from France. Consensus of international feeling strongly favors a return of Alsace to France, but in case of doubt a plebiscite of native-born Alsatians would settle the question.

Switzerland's integrity as a nation cannot be questioned. Her political and historical life, strengthened by her physical features, preserves her a unit in spite of the diversity of the language of her people. The overwhelming majority of German-speaking Swiss is just

as loyal to Helvetia as are the French or the Italian-speaking inhabitants.

Italy's rights have manifestly been violated by past treaties which were merely "arbitrary decisions of a few negotiators trying to secure by chicanery or persuasion the interests of this or that dynasty or nation" (Lloyd George). The Trentino belongs to Italy by all the rights of language, geography, politics, and history; and no power of man can permanently keep her from it. 11v

Although Italian politics, history, and culture are supreme on the east shore of the Adriatic, there are eight times as many Slavs there as Italians. The nationality of this whole region will be difficult to determine. But statesmen will do well to bear in mind the determinants of nationality, and with due reference to their comparative weight will most probably make a reasonable and just decision. But the question must be settled, and in a satisfactory manner, if

permanent peace is to ensue. To this end the Allies have already dedicated themselves. President Wilson has just said: "A readjustment of all the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality". With reason and justice guided by the determinants of nationality, this end can be consummated.

The Balkan situation is a puzzle. But if our criteria be observed, order can be restored. The provinces of Carniola and Illyria, on the borderland of Italy and Austria, must belong to one or the other of these two nations. The two provinces possess no marked political, historical, or geographical distinction, and are apparently not capable of self-government. Their only distinction is their language, which is Slovene. A plebiscite would most justly decide the question. In case the decision should favor Italy, a right of way for Austria to the Adriatic with Trieste as an interna-



tional city should be arranged, as every nation should if possible have access to the sea.

The Jugo-Slavs of Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Montenegro are sufficiently one in language and political temperament to guarantee national stability. They are a Slavic people, and the physical features of their home are homogeneous enough, with the aid of a common language and temperament, to enable them to develop into a strong, independent nation. Italy's claims, especially on the Dalmatian coast, must be carefully and sympathetically considered, but it must be remembered that there are eight times as many Slavs as Italians on the eastern shores of the Adriatic.

Albania is populated by an Aryan people and speaks a language (Skip) which has very little in common with that either of the Jugo-Slavs or of the Greeks. The position is an independent

one between Jugo-Slavonia and Greece. Yet there is no national feeling among them. They have no common aim, but they are intolerant of any alien authority. In short, they have not yet completely passed out of the nomad into the agricultural stage. But their linguistic and geographical conditions warrant a state of independence, and with the passage of time and sympathetic guidance they can easily be conceived of as developing into a strong and independent nation. At any rate it would be a mistake to force them under the control either of Jugo-Slavonia or of Greece or yet of Italy. An oversight by Italy as the nearest strong nation may be arranged with a view to later independence.

To Greece by all the rights of language, politics, and history belong Crete and certain islands near the coast of Asia Minor. It is, however, questionable whether the geographical position

of the islands on the coast of Asia Minor should allow them to belong to Greece. They are so closely bound up with the life of Asia Minor, that only a plebiscite of the natives ought to decide their destiny. But a large part of Macedonia, stretching far eastward into present Bulgarian territory, belongs by reason and justice to Greece. The boundary line between Bulgaria and Greece would have to be carefully considered.

Bulgaria must be bounded on the north by the Danube, on the west by the territory of Jugo-Slavonia—a boundary line which can easily be made on a physical basis—on the east by the Black Sea, but on the south its rights must be weighed over against those of both Greece and Turkey.

The Roumanians are a Latin people, and therefore distinct from their immediate neighbors. After many years of subjugation to the Turks, Roumania has in recent years, as a result of successive

rebellions, grown into an independent nation. But its national boundaries do not yet extend sufficiently far to include all Roumanians. In Roumania itself are about seven million people, but just beyond the borders of the present kingdom are three million other Roumanians who are anxious to join their countrymen in a greater Roumania.

Linguistically, not only Transylvania but also Bessarabia should be included in the country of Roumania. There are no geographical obstacles, and all the conditions that go to foster political and historical unity are present. A portion of the Dobruja, say Silistria, for the same reason, will probably have to be joined to Bulgaria. The boundary should be made with sympathy and care, as also the boundaries between Transylvania and Hungary and between Bessarabia and Russia.

The Czecho-Slovaks, very completely separated by Austria and Hungary

from their kinsmen, the Jugo-Slavs, should form an independent nation. It should include the present territory of Bohemia and Moravia. The greatest difficulty in connection with the possible independence of this Czecho-Slovak nation is that it would have no access to the sea, a condition which President Wilson feels is so necessary. Another possible solution, which should be decided by a plebiscite, would be the establishment of the independent equality of Bohemia, Moravia, and Austria into a confederation, with possibly Illyria and Carniola, all forming an Empire or a United States.

A similar difficulty presents itself in connection with Ruthenia. Ruthenians are Slavs, and most akin to the Little Russians. Hungary likewise presents a difficulty. The inhabitants, who are Magyars and Asiatic in origin, form a linguistic unit. Perhaps Hungary, Ruthenia, Moravia, and Bohemia could



be formed into a confederation with Austria. Linguistically we have in this combination four separate nations; historically Bohemia is a distinct nationality, as are also Austria and Hungary. Bohemia also has a keen sense of separate nationality. But geographically they all form a unit, and access to the sea could be procured by way of Trieste. Most doubt exists as to the destiny of Ruthenia, but as in the case of Carniola and Illyria a plebiscite would decide whether it should unite with Little Russia, or with the Austrian confederacy, or stand alone. The one thing which future statesmen should make certain is that each of these states should be free and equal, and a confederation should be encouraged.

Lloyd George has just declared that genuine self-government on true democratic principles must be granted to those Austro-Hungarian nationalities who have long desired it. And Presi-

dent Wilson says that autonomous development must be accorded to the peoples of Austria-Hungary. That would be brought about by due regard to the determinants of nationality.

The head of the confederation already referred to would be Austria. But she is a Teutonic nation, distinct in every way from Hungary, and different from Bohemia, Moravia, Ruthenia, Illyria, and Carniola in language and history. If the problem of access to the sea could otherwise be solved the most natural combination of these states would be: a union of Austria with Germany with which it is closely related; the erection of a separate nation of Hungary; the combination of Bohemia and Moravia into one state; the union of Ruthenia with Little Russia; and the combination of Illyria and Carniola under the protection of Austria as a part of the German Empire, or, most appropriately, their union with Italy.

The problem of the partition of the Austro-Hungarian Empire is a difficult one, but a necessity to the stability of Europe. If the work can be accomplished with due regard to the conditions of language, geography, politics, and history, the result will be lasting.

At last, statesmen have uttered the name of Poland. From 1863, when the Polish question had for the fourth time brought Europe to the verge of war, until now, rulers have not dared to raise this difficult question. Poland, once a mighty nation, is now nothing but a problem—but a problem which must be solved if a just and lasting peace is to ensue.

Geographically, Poland is hard to define. There is a strange lack of determining boundaries on both east and west, but it should extend from the Baltic in the north to the Carpathians on the south. However, linguistically, politically, and historically, Poland is a

unit. She desires national independence, and it should be accorded her. Her restoration should be complete. Prussia must give up her Polish lands; Galicia must be restored by Austria; and Russia has already promised to give up that portion of Poland which is within her boundaries.

There are over twenty million Poles, and they should govern themselves. Their outlet to the sea will naturally be the old Polish city of Danzig. If restoration be brought about, the Niobe of nations will once more be a flourishing state, capable of taking its place in the great procession of independent modern nations.

There is a group of small provinces on the south-eastern shore of the Baltic Sea which need adjustment. They are: Lithuania, Kurland, Esthonia, and Livonia. The people of Lithuania, Kurland, and Livonia are Aryans, while those of Esthonia are Finns. Geograph-

ically, they are a unit; linguistically there are two groups; but historically and politically only the Lithuanians are conscious of any distinct national desires. They may be erected into four independent states in the Russian confederation, or into a separate confederation of southern Baltic States.

Finland was transferred to Russia in 1809, but linguistically, geographically, and historically she is a unit, and should form an independent nation. Russia has already shown indications of recognizing her independence, and Sweden has welcomed her as a sovereign people. No valid argument can be discovered against the freedom of Finland. All the determinants of nationality are present, and the people have a strong sense of national independence. It was only the power of Sweden first, and then that of Russia, which has held her in bondage up till now. She has already been welcomed into the company of free nations,



and the world peace will have no difficulty in recognizing her place.

About Sweden, Norway, and Holland there is no question of integrity. International frontiers are well defined, and future international agreement should be such as to cause these countries no alarm.

But with Denmark the case is different. The provinces of Schleswig and Holstein belonged to Denmark previous to 1866, when they were annexed to Prussia. According to our criteria Schleswig belongs rightly to Denmark and should be restored to her. But Holstein is linguistically, politically, and historically a part of Germany. It will probably be difficult to settle the geographical frontiers between Denmark and Germany, but they should follow as closely as possible the lines of language and history. A plebiscite would undoubtedly give Holstein to Germany and ✓ Schleswig to Denmark.

✓ Whatever the fortunes of war may be, German territory will remain intact. The Allies do not intend to interfere with that. Both Lloyd George and Wilson emphatically declare that no one wants to disrupt the German confederacy. The German provinces, of course, excepting Schleswig, Lorraine, and Alsace, form a perfect unit, linguistically, geographically, politically, and historically. There is a keen sense of nationality, although, perhaps, an exaggerated and unjust one. The German people will be accorded the same power of self-determination as all others whether small or great. Their political institutions will not be interfered with by foreign nations, but they will be compelled to assume the same attitude toward others. They will not be permitted to retain in subjection any nations which demand freedom, nor will they be allowed to assume control of any independent nation against its will. /

Austria may elect to become a state in the German confederacy, and so may Holstein, Luxemburg, and Moreset; but Lorraine and Alsace, Schleswig and Poland, must be given their freedom unless by a plebiscite the peoples of these provinces freely decide to remain in the German confederation.

In the British Isles there is one discordant note—Ireland. A plebiscite in Scotland and Wales would show how truly they are in accord with England, the leader of the confederacy. All the determinants of nationality combine to strengthen the union of England, Scotland, and Wales into one nationality. Further proof of the unity of these states is unnecessary.

Linguistically, politically, and historically Ireland belongs to the same group. This is likewise true geographically, for rivers and seas do not form impassable national barriers. Moreover the security of Ireland is bound up physically

with that of Great Britain. The chief cause of irritation in Ireland is confessedly religion. But a study of the unity of the United States or of that of the German Empire or of that of Serbia will show that religion cannot be used as a criterion of nationality. Ireland's irritant keeps cropping out in Quebec. But both Ireland and Quebec are so essentially bound up with their neighboring provinces and countries that it is questionable whether even a plebiscite should be allowed to separate them. Would the United States agree to the secession of, say, Massachusetts? If so, it is conceivable that Canada would agree to a secession of Quebec, or Great Britain to a secession of Ireland.

Ireland must be given Home Rule. She must be as free as Scotland or Wales, but the determinants of nationality render a verdict in favor of her remaining in union with Great Britain.

An objection may be made to a comparison of the relationship of Massachusetts to the United States with that of Ireland to Great Britain. It may be said that the Irish are a different race. Even if this were so, we must remember that race is no criterion of nationality, as we have already seen; and, furthermore, the Irish are not a pure race. But while the Irish are different in chief racial characteristics from the English, they are not different in this respect from the Welsh and Scotch. Even racially, an impartial student would place Ireland in the same national group as Wales and Scotland, which are already closely united with England.

As soon as Ireland learns the lesson of religious freedom there will be no question about her place in the British confederation. There are signs that point to this consummation. The Roman Catholics of the south, though having the numerical advantage, should not



attempt to force their will upon the Protestants of the north, who, though inferior in number, are admittedly superior in human development. Ireland is not a unit in political thought, and until she is, the constraining criteria of national life will bind her to Great Britain.

Russian stability is a necessity to European peace, especially western Russia. Now that the Empire is overthrown, it is difficult to predict what the final outcome in Russia will be. The Great and Little Russians, by all the criteria of nationality, belong together. It is possible that two independent nations may be formed, but linguistically, geographically, politically, and historically, they are one.

Siberia may be formed into a separate nation, as also other portions of eastern Russia, but this question lies outside our present interest. Russia, however, must give up Finland, Poland, and perhaps

Bessarabia, Livonia, Esthonia, Kurland, and Lithuania. Let us hope that Russia will develop into a great democratic nation or confederation of nations, whose weight will be placed into the balance of a just and lasting peace.

As to Turkey, let it be remembered that there is no such thing as a Mohammedan criterion of nationality. Turkey is not a nation because it is Mohammedan, any more than the United States is a nation because it is Christian. Religion does not make a nation. There are more Mohammedans outside of Turkey than in it. The assumption of the Caliphate by the Sultan of Turkey is a violation of religious rights. The Sultan is no more the head of the Mohammedan Church than King George is of the Anglican Church or Emperor Charles is of the Roman Catholic Church. He may assume the rôle of protector, but that is a different matter. Religiously, Mohammedans have long demanded a sev-

erance of the Mohammedan Caliphate from the Turkish Sultanate, and very recently, in June 1916, Hussain, the Grand Sherif of Mecca, has declared his independence. The Caliphate belongs to Mecca and not to Constantinople. But, as we have seen, religion is no criterion of nationality.

By all the laws of nationality, the Turks are an independent people and nation. They are of mixed race, but so are the majority of modern peoples. It has been said that Turkey is a theocracy. This may be granted. But she is nevertheless a nation. Her theocratic character has been assumed, but her language, geography, politics, and history all proclaim her a nation. The Jews formed a theocracy, but they were nevertheless a nation.

But Turkey has violated the independence of other peoples, towards whom she has been murderous and tyrannical. The Allies realize this and in their reply

to President Wilson's note, before America entered the war, they declare for the "liberation of the people who now lie beneath the murderous tyranny of the Turks, and the expulsion from Europe of the Ottoman Empire, which has proved itself so radically alien to Western civilization" (§ 8).

On further reflection the Allies, including America, have modified this demand. They still rightly insist upon the liberation of enslaved people, but they do not stipulate the expulsion of Turkey from Europe. Wilson says: "The Turkish portion of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty". Notice that he says "Turkish portion", assuming the need of liberating non-Turkish peoples. Lloyd George says: "We do not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the homelands of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople". Notice the phrase "home-

lands", which is equivalent to Wilson's "Turkish portion".

Lloyd George, however, goes a step further, namely, in defining Constantinople as being within Turkish "homelands". The Allies' earlier idea was to limit Turkey to Asia Minor, where, according to all the determinants of nationality, the Turkish nation should find a home. But, of course, the strip of country on the European side of the Bosphorus is inhabited predominantly by Turks, and if Turkey is to retain Constantinople the surrounding territory should be included.

However, the boundaries of Bulgaria and Greece, on the basis of language, geography, politics, and history, could be extended further south and east. The vilayet of Constantinople would remain, but in a reduced form. But all the Allies demand that the passage between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean be internationalized and neutralized.



It is questionable whether the vilayet of Constantinople should not be given to Greece or to Bulgaria, although the criteria of nationality are in favor of its present owners. At any rate the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles should be made international and neutral.

It is natural that great and strong nations should assume or be given the oversight of groups of peoples who are both weak and undeveloped and who have no sense of nationality. It has always been so and has usually proved beneficial. No one will deny the good Great Britain has done in India and Egypt and the advantages derived by Cuba from the fostering care of the United States. But there are limitations, and one would need to be very brave to undertake a defence of the Turkish Empire's treatment of her dependent peoples. On the contrary, it is no injustice to say with the Allies in their reply to President Wilson's note,

that the Ottoman Empire's rule over her dependent peoples has been a "murderous tyranny". The right to exist as a free and sovereign nation cannot be denied to Turkey in spite of her barbarities. But her rule of "murderous tyranny" over other peoples can in no possible manner be justified. If her rule were beneficial and her subject peoples were undeveloped and not ready to govern themselves no one would dream of interfering. But her rule has been tyrannous in the extreme, and though her subject peoples have shown themselves incapable of self-government they must be removed from under her control.

Armenia should be freed and placed under the tutelage of a strong European nation till she is capable of self-government. This is necessary in order to preserve her from spoliation and disintegration. All the conditions of nationality exist in embryo; but they need to

be developed. Care should be exercised in fixing natural geographical boundaries as clearly as possible, and protection should be afforded her till she comes of age. The same is true of Kurdistan and Syria. Both are nations, but in an imperfect state of development. They must be nursed and cared for. Their boundaries must be fixed and they must be encouraged in self-government.

Because of the great interest of France in Syria, it would be according to justice to appoint France the guardian of these three peoples. France has shown herself to be a careful and humane ruler of undeveloped peoples, and nothing would make more for permanence among these peoples than the guiding and controlling hand of France.

Palestine is not a nation at all. There is not another country like it in the whole world. But all the elements of nationality are there in undeveloped

and unused form, except a people, in the strict sense of the term, and a language. There can naturally be no nation without a people. But there is a peculiar people scattered among the nations of the earth which has never lost its identity. It is the Jewish people. Many Jews long to see their ancient home, the abode of their ancestors, restored to them. They would return thither in thousands. It is a small country in area, and the Jews would soon become the predominating population, without doing violence to its present inhabitants.

Palestine is so bound up with religious sentiment, Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan, that the erection of Palestine as a neutral country under international protection, with perhaps the United States of America in the chair, would be most conducive to stability. Jewish settlements could be encouraged with the hope that a Jewish nation would develop and become permanent. But it

seems that even if Palestine should develop into a Jewish nation, with all the rights and liberties of a nation, nevertheless a proviso is necessary. Jerusalem and other towns in Palestine are not only Jewish but also Christian and Mohammedan shrines. Consequently one of two things should happen: Palestine should be constituted as a permanent international and neutral country, governed by an international board; or it should be restored to the Jewish people, at first under international direction, but with the idea of gradually developing into a nation, provided certain locations and shrines, and approaches to them, be subject to international control. In any case Palestine cannot return to the Turk.

East of Syria and Palestine and south of Kurdistan are the regions of Mesopotamia and Arabia, and west of Arabia is Egypt. Great Britain has already accomplished wonders in Egypt. Any one



acquainted with the modern history of that country knows what strides have been made under British rule. No one who has the welfare of undeveloped peoples at heart would ever dream of desiring to see Great Britain give up her splendid work. It must be continued.

The people of Arabia have recently proclaimed themselves a separate monarchy under the Grand Sherif of Mecca, who has taken the title "King of Hedjaz". Arabia, as is well known, is not ready for self-government. There, as in Egypt, are in embryo all the determinants of nationality, but they are as yet undeveloped.

The site of the ancient empire of Babylonia and Assyria can be made the most prosperous country in the world with proper care. Turkey has criminally neglected this paradise, with the result that to-day it is one of the most miserable countries in existence.

The British, who have recently con-

quered Bagdad, and who have shown themselves in India and Egypt to be so capable in handling Mohammedan peoples, should be asked to take both Mesopotamia and Arabia under their protection. Great Britain has the experience, and she has the ability, and if these portions of the Ottoman Empire are to develop and grow into self-respecting and self-governing peoples no one can lead them to that end better than Britain.

Before a world peace can be brought about the status of Germany's colonies must be settled. On this score, President Wilson has just said: "The interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined." Now, no one demands that France, Belgium, Italy, or Great Britain give up their colonies. The peoples of these colonies must be under the protection of some strong nation. They are not ready to take the

reins into their own hands, and if they were deserted they would be at the mercy of all the forces of disintegration. No, they are in safe keeping. Witness, for example, the colonies of Great Britain which are gradually being given their independence. Newfoundland has just been proclaimed a Dominion, Canada has long ago been such, and Australia is a great Commonwealth. They have the right to secede. They possess all the determinants of nationality, but they prefer to remain, not so much under the protection of Great Britain, for they are now laying down their precious lives to protect her, but associated with her in the great Commonwealth of free and equal nations which we know as the British Empire.

But there is a decided question as to whether the former colonies of Germany should be returned. It would be perfectly safe to apply President Wilson's criterion to the former German colonies,

for, with the exception perhaps of German South East Africa, they would almost to a man vote for their liberation. And so would German South East Africa if only genuine native-born inhabitants be permitted to vote, and if the *askaris*, or German mercenaries, be excluded. Even were they included it would be safe to guess that a large majority would oppose German rule.

However, it is highly questionable whether the native inhabitants of African colonies are in a state of sufficient development to make a choice. It is not always wise to allow children their choice, and many inhabitants of Africa are yet but children.

In South Africa there has been set up in a most remarkable manner a great free, self-governing nation. A few years ago these peoples were at bitter war with Great Britain, but now are giving their best and their all to her in her fight for justice. What Great Britain has done

in South Africa has never been paralleled in the history of the world. She has proved herself incomparable as a colonizing power. On the contrary Germany is notoriously stupid in her dealings with colonial people. No greater blessing could possibly come to the former German colonies in Africa than that they be turned over to the genius of Great Britain's colonizing power. What a triumph to "Darkest Africa" if from Egypt to Cape Colony and from Kamerun to East Africa there were established a great confederation of free nations in union with the rest of the mighty Commonwealth of Great Britain! This is no dream; it is the conviction of many of the greatest minds of Great Britain and South Africa. It would be a crime to humanity to do anything which would help to retard or prevent this development. Great Britain at the peace tables cannot appear too insistent upon her claim as conqueror in



Africa because of the stand which she has always taken for freedom and liberty, and too great concern on her part may be interpreted as land-grabbing. But the other free nations should see to it that her genius in colony building should be entrusted with the noble task of bringing democracy and liberty to Africa.

## IV

### TOWARDS A JUST AND LASTING PEACE

**T**HE essence of autocracy is intolerance; that of democracy is tolerance. In an autocracy an individual or group of individuals undertakes to have its own way, and to subject everything to its will. In a democracy the government is of the people, by the people, and for the people. A democracy must have a leader and a government, but they will act only with the consent of the governed.

An autocracy has certain inherent advantages over a democracy. In an autocracy a decision can be made more rapidly than in a democracy; action can

be more concerted ; and laws can be more easily enforced. An autocracy is apt to be more orderly and systematic than a democracy. But the claim of democracy to universality consists in its essential liberty and justice. Government must be by the consent of the governed.

There are certain things which democracy cannot do with the same ease as an autocracy, and there are other things which it cannot do at all. God cannot make a valley without two hills, nor can democracy govern without certain justified restrictions placed upon all. In other words, liberty and license must be carefully and clearly differentiated. Law and order must prevail ; but it must be just and the same for all, whether governors or governed. In an autocracy the voice of one or of a small group alone is heard ; in a democracy every man may speak.

The new world in which we are to live must be a democratic world as far as

possible. It should at least be democratic as far as international relations are concerned. Nothing should be done internationally without the consent of all nations. But democracy, ideal though it be, cannot be forced upon an independent nation. Lloyd George has well said that Germany's form of government is a question for the German people to decide. If they want an autocracy no one can forbid it. They can have tyrants as rulers if they choose. But what other nations will insist upon is that Germany act toward other nations in an international democratic way. This is exactly what the Allies are fighting for. They intend to establish an international democracy, or, in other words, an international law which is absolutely democratic. Then each nation will be free to choose its own form of government but it will not be free to act toward other nations in any other than a democratic way.

The world's greatest and noblest purpose at this moment is to "achieve a righteous end to this war" (Lloyd George), and when the statesmen assemble around the table of peace the settlement which they should have in mind is one which must not bear the seed of future war.

But there must be a definite and specific purpose in the minds of Allied statesmen in their battle of words around the peace table. This purpose has already been enunciated. As far as possible all causes of war must be removed; in other words, national boundaries must be settled not necessarily in accordance with the wish of any one nation or group of nations, but according to justice and the determinants of nationality. In settling the frontiers of nations the following principle, enunciated by Lloyd George, must be borne in mind: "Government with the consent of the governed must be the basis of any



territorial settlement." In the establishment of international law, President Wilson's principle must be remembered: "Justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their rights to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak"; "unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us." Only in this way can the sanctity of international treaty be reinstated. There must be "no secret understandings of any kind" (Wilson); everything must be open and above board. There must be no "most favored" nations, for as Lloyd George recently said, speaking for Great Britain: "Equality among nations, small as well as great, is one of the fundamental issues this country and her allies are fighting to establish in this war." All national aggression must be swept away and each nation must be allowed to develop within its national rights.

With the end of war will come the period of reconstruction. It is then that clear heads and true hearts will be needed. It is then that there should be set on foot that movement which characterizes the United States of America and the British Empire, namely, confederation. The confederation of states must expand into the confederation of nations. President Wilson has expressed the idea in a general way: "A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike."

To be more specific: the doctrine of united sovereign states, applied by the United States of America when the Union was formed, and by Great Britain in the building up of her empire, must be applied internationally. It might well begin by a loose confederation of the

United States of America and the British Empire. There need be no change in the form of either government, but an entente equivalent to a confederation might well be established. Into this confederacy might come democratic France, and Belgium, and Italy. Other nations would join, one after another, each sovereign in itself, independent and self-governing, but recognizing certain international agreements which would constitute the confederacy. Such a confederation of democratic nations would be in itself strong enough to police the world in the interest of liberty and equality. And it is not beyond reason to believe that in time the whole world would be brought into this confederation of free nations, which would not be a British Commonwealth or a United States of America, but a United States of the World.

In view of this, certain interesting developments may be noted:

With a confederation of the nations of the world, the problem of the freedom of the seas and international waterways would be solved. As long as there remains an untamed and irresponsible nation there can be no such thing as freedom of the seas. This war has surely taught that. The seas being seas, it is questionable whether their freedom can ever be consummated until a world confederation has been established, for as long as any one nation refuses to abide absolutely by international agreement there is danger of her running amuck on seas where there naturally can be no frontiers. Certain specific waterways, however, can be internationalized and neutralized, just as easily as the determination of certain frontiers. We have seen that the Bosphorus and Dardanelles should be internationalized and neutralized, especially, for the purpose of affording to Russia, Bulgaria, Roumania, and Armenia a free passage to

the sea. The same may be said of the Suez Canal, the Kiel Canal, the Panama Canal, and the Straits of Gibraltar, or any other such passage or waterway. This would be settled by international agreement.

Another interesting development may ensue as a result of world confederation. As we have already often observed, language is the chief determinant of nationality. In fact, the greatest deterrent to internationalization is diversity of language; it is also a source of much international misunderstanding. But on the other hand, the love of language is second only to the love of country; in fact, the love of country is inalienably bound up with love of language. All that is dear and sacred in the feeling of nationality is stored up in language, and language is required to bring it to perfection.

Now, in a world confederation, such as that just described, almost every



nation would speak its own language. ✓ While this would be a source of some difficulty, it should not be discouraged because of the close bond between language and nationality. But there could be established by international agreement an official language by means of which all international business would be conducted. This language should be a living one, preferably English, because of the probable great majority of English-speaking states in the first stages of the confederacy. Thus, most people in time would become bilingual; each nation using its own language, but capable of speaking the official and international tongue. And it is not altogether Utopian to believe that in the far distant future the whole world may be brought to speak one language. This in itself would be the means of preventing countless causes of international irritation; it would be the source of mutual understanding; it would form a common

object of love; and it would help to translate national love into terms of world love.

Finally, the meaning of this world crisis should be considered. A bird's-eye view of the whole history of mankind upon this planet will show a remarkable fact about the developments of human society. It will teach us that the earliest unit of social life, among primitive peoples, was the family. Everything centered in that unit. With the development of the race, groups of related families formed clans; then, groups of clans formed tribes, and, finally, groups of tribes amalgamated into nations. This is where we are to-day. Human society at the present time is made up of a group of nations. Anthropologists and historians assure us that this is how human society has developed. But is that the last step? Surely not. The next step may take thousands of years, just as each step in the past took

many centuries, but it will certainly be made.

We are witnessing the birth pangs of a new world order, namely, internationalism. The step human society is now girding up its loins to take is the grouping of nations into a world system, into internationalism. This will fulfil the eternal principle of unity. Scientists tell us of the unity of humanity; evolutionists tell us how this unity gradually came about; and philosophers tell us that suffering is one of the fundamental conditions of development. All these elements are observable in the present world conflict. We are witnessing the beginning of a new era.

The determinants of nationality have been seen to be language, geography, politics, and history. In a developed form they will become the determinants of internationalism. The next step in human development will witness the growth of a world language, which will

become as dear to the human heart as any one language of the past had become to any one nation. National geography will develop into world geography, and "national barriers" and "the freedom of the seas" will become merely interesting historical relics. World politics will be the order of the day, when the great Commonwealth of Nations is established. And national history will be interesting only as a means of tracing out the evolution of human society from its primitive to its more developed form. Then, diversity will become unity, nationalism will become internationalism, and a just and lasting peace will be realized.











D  
613  
M4

Mercer, Samuel Alfred  
Browne  
Allied and American  
peace as seen by a linguist

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

---

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

---



